



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,359	03/31/2004	Karl Pfleger	0026-0070	5012
<div>44989      7590      08/22/2007</div> <div>HARRITY SNYDER, LLP 11350 Random Hills Road SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA 22030</div>				
			<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>BELL, CORY C</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>2164</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE</div> <div>08/22/2007</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>PAPER</div>

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/813,359	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PFLEGER, KARL	
	<b>Examiner</b> Cory C. Bell	<b>Art Unit</b> 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/22/2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7-13 and 27-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-37 and 39-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7-13 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Claims 27-37, and 39-41 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected groups II-IV, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 5/22/2007. Applicant stated:

“Further, M.P.E.P. § 806.05(d) states that restriction is only proper when there would be a serious burden if restriction were not required, as evidenced by separate classification, status, or field of search. The Examiner has not provided any evidence of serious burden. The Examiner alleged that "there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification" (Restriction Requirement, page 3). Applicant submits that the Examiner's allegation lacks merit. The Examiner has admitted that Groups II-IV are all classified in class 707, subclass 5. Thus, the Examiner's has provided no evidence of serious burden.”

It is noted that the elected group I was drawn to 707, subclass 3.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman (US 6006225).

Art Unit: 2164

1. Claim 1

As per claim 1 Bowman teaches: receiving a search query;(Bowman Col 3 lines 5-9)  
determining whether the received search query includes an entity name; (Bowman col 6 lines 59-64)  
determining whether to rewrite the received search query based on information relating to prior searches involving the entity name;(Bowman Col 6 line 59- col 7 line 34)  
rewriting the received search query when it is determined that the received search query should be rewritten based on the information relating to the prior searches(Bowman Col 6 line 59- col 7 line 34);  
performing a search based on one of the received search query and the rewritten search query to obtain search results; (Bowman Figure 9)  
and presenting the search results. (Bowman Figure 9)

Bowman teaches the step of “performing a search based on one of the received search query and the rewritten search query to obtain search results; (Bowman Figure 9),” by providing hyperlinks to the rewritten search queries, in contrast the claimed invention performs this step automatically. However, MPEP 2144.04 states , if the facts in a prior legal decision are sufficiently similar to those in an application under examination, the examiner may use the rationale used by the court.

*In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958) (Appellant argued that claims to a permanent mold casting apparatus for molding trunk pistons were allowable over the prior art because the claimed invention combined “old permanent-

Art Unit: 2164

mold structures together with a timer and solenoid which automatically actuates the known pressure valve system to release the inner core after a predetermined time has elapsed.” The court held that broadly providing an automatic or mechanical means to replace a manual activity which accomplished the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art.).

As such the claimed invention is obvious over Bowman.

2. Claim 2

As per claim 2 Bowman teaches the limitations as follows: providing a link to the received search query when the search is performed based on the rewritten search query.  
(Figure 9 “Back” )

3. Claim 10

As per claim 10 Bowman teaches the limitations as follows: modifying the received search query to include a restrict identifier associated with the entity name. (Bowman figure 9 shows adding a related term which is a restrict identifier using the broadest reasonable interpretation as it identifies a manner in which to further restrict the search results)

4. Claim 11

Bowman teaches the limitations of claim 11 as follows: the performing a search based on

Art Unit: 2164

one of the received search query and the rewritten search query comprises: searching a repository of documents using the rewritten search query when the received search query is rewritten.(Bowman Col 5 lines 11-25 and Col 1 lines 44-46)

5. Claim 12: See Claim 1 rejection.

6. Claim 13: See Claim 1 rejection.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman in view of Korda(US 6564210).

7. Claim 7

Bowman fails to expressly disclose the limitations of claim 7. However, these limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view Korda. First applicant claims “identifying entity identifiers associated with documents that were selected in connection with the prior searches involving the entity name” Col 8 lines 44-59 of Korda teaches storing data on documents selected by a user after a search, this data including the URL of the document which is an entity identifier as well as the topic which is also an entity identifier, Bowman teaches the search including or being an entity name.

determining a total number of selections for each of the identified entity identifiers,  
(Korda Col 9 lines 14-19 and Col 9 lines 20-25)

Art Unit: 2164

and determining that the received search query should be rewritten when an entity identifier associated with the entity name receives a total number of selections greater than other ones of the identified entity identifiers. ( Korda Col 9 lines 14-25 teaches using the identifiers to narrow the search results, and Bowman col 6 lines 32-49 teaches making restrictions based on frequency)

Thus the limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as one would have been motivated to provide these features to increase the productivity of the user (Korda col 2 lines 8-14)

#### 8. Claim 8

Bowman fails to expressly disclose using a threshold to determine when to perform a rewrite.

However the limitation of claim 8 would have been obvious in view of Korda as follows

determining whether the total number of selections for the entity identifier associated with the entity name is greater than a threshold.( Korda Col 9 lines 14-19)

and determining that the received search query should not be rewritten when the total number of selections for the entity identifier associated with the entity name is not greater than the threshold. (Korda teaches not further restricting the results until the threshold is met in Col 9 lines 14-19)

Thus the limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as one would have been motivated to provide these features to increase the productivity of the user (Korda col 2 lines 8-14)

Art Unit: 2164

## 9. Claim 9

identifying entity identifiers associated with documents that were selected in connection with the prior searches involving the entity name, (See Claims 7 and 8 rejections) determining a distribution of a total number of selections for each of the identified entity identifiers, and determining that the received search query should be rewritten when the distribution indicates that the total number of selections for an entity identifier associated with the entity name is peaked compared to the total number of selections for a subset of other ones of the identified entity identifiers. (These limitations would have been obvious as Korda teaches counting the number of selections as shown above and Bowman teaches making the selection of further restriction based on frequency and ordered based on frequency in col 6 lines 32-49)

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman in view of Fries (US 6460029).

## 10. Claim 38

As per claim 38, A method, comprising: receiving a search query; (See Claim 1 rejection) determining whether the received search query includes an entity name; (See Claim 1 rejection) determining whether to rewrite the received search query based on information relating to prior searches involving the entity name;(See Claim 1 rejection) rewriting the received search query when it is determined that the received search query should be rewritten; determining whether to provide a suggestion of rewriting the received search query, as a rewriting suggestion, based on information relating to prior searches involving the entity name when it is determined that the



Art Unit: 2164

received search query should not be rewritten;(Bowman teaches providing suggestions to a user for rewriting a query as discussed above but does not teach automatically rewriting the query, Fries col 23 lines 22-26 teaches automatically doing the suggested task when the selected task has been chosen repeatedly, thus the preceding underlined limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as they would speed up the search process) generating the rewriting suggestion when it is determined that the rewriting suggestion should be provided;(Bowman Figure 9) performing a search based on one of the received search query and the rewritten search query to obtain search results (Bowman Figure 9); presenting the search results;(Bowman figure 9) and presenting the rewriting suggestion when it is determined that the rewriting suggestion should be provided. (Bowman figure 9)

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cory C. Bell whose telephone number is (571) 272 2736. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272 4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**